



6/9/2011
#7
W. Lawson
1/31/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant: Ramanathan Ramanathan § Art Unit: 2611

Serial No.: 09/138,807 § Examiner: Jason P. Salce

Filed: August 21, 1998 §

Title: Confirming Video Transmissions § Docket No. ITL.0083US
(P6269)

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003
Technology Center 2600

REPLY TO PAPER NO. 6

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed October 23, 2002, please accept the attached corrected drawing and consider the following remarks:

Drawings:

The corrected drawing is attached to this Office Action as requested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections:

Independent claims 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman in view of Masaki, et al. Both independent claims 11 and 16 call for providing an on-going count of bits transmitted and time elapsed from the point and time when a first marker is transmitted. The Examiner concedes that Goodman does not teach this limitation. It is respectfully submitted Masaki also does not teach this limitation.

Masaki discloses a way to control retransmission using a video coding device 150 that transmits a block of coded data to a base station 152. See column 73, lines 56-57; Figure 9. The base station 152 sends the data to a second base station 153, which then transmits the data to the video decoding device 151. See column 74, lines 1-3. Thus, a data block is transmitted from the

Date of Deposit: January 23, 2003
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

Debra Cutrona